

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/792,122

Applicant(s)

ANTOCH, STEVEN T.

Examiner

Alex Gofman

Art Unit

2162

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alex Gofman.

(3) Richard Pantoliano.

(2) Shahid Alam (Primary 2162).

(4) Ali Imam (58,755).

Date of Interview: 31 January 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 9, 16, and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required


Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Amendments discussed to Claims 1 and 9 overcome the outstanding 35 USC 112 1st paragraph and 35 USC 112 2nd Paragraph rejections. The discussed amendment for Claims 1 and 9 would overcome the potential 35 USC 101 rejection.

Applicant further agreed to amend the Independent Claims to more specifically claim the singleton model element field handler object.

The Amendments discussed to Claims 16 and 18 overcomes the cited portion of the outstanding prior art.

Applicant will submit Amendment with the restructured Claim language..



SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER